

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-4 and 6-11 have been amended. Claims 12-13 have been added. No claims have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,015,088 to Dubnowski et al. ("Dubnowski"). Claims 2-3 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubnowski in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,915 to Sasaki ("Sasaki"). Claims 5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubnowski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,784,532 to McDonough ("McDonough").

Dubnowski appears to be directed to an apparatus in which a speech signal is sampled and a resulting digital signal is clipped to form a signal having three logic states (+1, 0, -1). An autocorrelation function of this signal is determined and a pitch period is determined from a location and magnitude of a peak value of the autocorrelation function. The Office Action has cited a low pass filter 21 and A-D converter 22 of FIGURE 1 of Dubnowski as teaching a conformity function as recited in claims 1 and 6. Even if it is assumed, for the sake of argument, that the Office Action is correct in this regard, Applicant respectfully submits that Dubnowski fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claims 1 and 6 as amended, namely, calculating for each segment an autocorrelation function for a signal and detecting peaks in the autocorrelation function (claim 1) and an autocorrelation calculation unit for calculating for each segment an autocorrelation function for a signal and a peak detector for detecting peaks in the autocorrelation function (claim 6). Applicant respectfully submits that Dubnowski fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least these distinguishing feature of independent claims 1 and 6, respectively.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that Dubnowski fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least these distinguishing feature of independent claims 1 and 6, respectively. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 6 as anticipated by Dubnowski is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither of Sasaki nor McDonough supplies the deficiencies noted above of Dubnowski with respect to independent claims 1 and 6. Dependent claims 2-5 and 7-11 depend from and further limit independent claims 1 and 6, respectively. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above, each of dependent claims 2-5 and 7-11 also distinguish over the cited references, singularly or in combination. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-5 and 7-11 is respectfully requested.

New dependent claims 12 and 13 have been added. Claim 12 depends from and further limits independent claim 1. Claim 13 depends from and further limits independent claim 6. By virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims, each of new dependent claims 12 and 13 is also deemed to be allowable.

In addition to the amendments discussed above, various amendments have been made to the claims for stylistic or antecedent-basis purposes. Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant has not intended by these amendments to narrow the claims in any way.

In view of the above, each of the presently-pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: July 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ross T. Robinson

Registration No.: 47,031

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant